UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF MAINE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

CRIMINAL ACTION

Plaintiff Docket: 2:14-cr-69-JDL-9

-versus-

JEAN TONY VALBRUN,

Defendant

Transcript of Proceedings

Pursuant to notice, the above-entitled matter came on for Sentencing held before THE HONORABLE JON D. LEVY, United States District Court Judge, in the United States District Court, Edward T. Gignoux Courthouse, 156 Federal Street, Portland, Maine on the 9th day of June, 2016 at 2:00 p.m. as follows:

Appearances:

For the Government: David B. Joyce, Esquire

Assistant United States Attorney

For the Defendant: Neale A. Duffett, Esquire

Dennis R. Ford Official Court Reporter

(Prepared from manual stenography and computer aided transcription)

```
1
              (Open court. Defendant present.)
              THE COURT: Good afternoon.
2
3
              MR. JOYCE: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: We're now proceeding in the case
4
5
     of United States versus Jean Valbrun. This is docket
     15-cr-69. Counsel, please identify yourself for the
6
7
     record.
              MR. JOYCE: David Joyce for the United States,
8
9
     Your Honor.
              MR. DUFFETT: Neale Duffett for Mr. Valbrun.
10
11
              THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Joyce, has the
12
     Government provided notice to any victims entitled to
     notice by law?
13
14
              MR. JOYCE: There are none in this case, Your
15
     Honor.
              THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Valbrun, I'd like
16
     you to stand please. Mr. Duffett, I know you suffered
17
18
     an injury. If it would be better for you to be seated
     today, that's fine.
19
20
              MR. DUFFETT: That's okay, Judge. That's
21
     fine.
22
              THE COURT: All right. Mr. Valbrun, we're
23
     here for a sentencing and the overall-purpose of this
24
     hearing is for me to issue a sentence based upon your
25
     conviction. I'm going to hear from the attorneys and
```

I'll hear from you as well if you wish to speak. I'll also hear from any witnesses that either side may present.

Now, I'm going to be asking you and Attorney

Duffett a series of questions. I want to be certain of
a number of things. The first is that you've received,
you've read, you understand the revised presentence
report that was issued in this case so we will be
discussing that.

I also want to make sure that there's nothing that in any way interferes with your ability to understand what is taking place in the courtroom today, and finally, overall it's my goal to make sure you understand the sentence that I impose and the reasons for it.

So I'm going to ask you some questions. If you don't understand the question, let me know. I'll rephrase it. If you want to have a chance to speak to Attorney Duffett before you respond, that's fine. Just let me know; do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Why don't you pull the microphone please closer to you. Mr. Valbrun, have you used any drugs or alcohol in the past 48 hours?

THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.

```
1
              THE COURT: Are you currently taking any
2
     medication?
3
              THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: How far did you go in school?
 4
5
              THE DEFENDANT: Graduate high school.
              THE COURT: And you can read and write,
6
7
     correct?
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
8
9
              THE COURT: Do you understand why you are here
10
     today?
11
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
12
              THE COURT: And what do you understand the
13
     purpose of this hearing to be?
14
              THE DEFENDANT: Sentencing.
15
              THE COURT: I didn't hear you.
16
              THE DEFENDANT: Sentencing.
17
              THE COURT: Sentencing. Is there anything
18
     which might in any way interfere with your ability to
     understand what is taking place today and what is being
19
20
     said or for that matter even hearing it?
21
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              No.
22
              THE COURT: No?
23
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              No.
24
              THE COURT: And do you authorize Attorney
25
     Duffett to act and speak on your behalf throughout this
```

```
1
     hearing?
2
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
3
              THE COURT: Attorney Duffett, have you read
     and discussed with Mr. Valbrun the revised presentence
4
5
     report in this case?
6
              MR. DUFFETT: Yes, Your Honor.
7
              THE COURT: I take it you've had ample time to
     do that?
8
9
              MR. DUFFETT: Yes, sir.
              THE COURT: Mr. Valbrun, have you read the
10
11
     revised presentence report in this case?
12
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: You've read the entire document?
13
14
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
15
              THE COURT: I take it that you understood it?
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
16
17
              THE COURT: And you've had plenty of time to
18
     discuss it with Mr. Duffett; is that correct?
19
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
20
              THE COURT: Attorney Duffett, in your written
21
     submission, or I should say in the revised presentence
22
     report itself, there's an indication that you object to
23
     the provision in the report regarding Mr. Valbrun's
24
     role in the offense.
25
              MR. DUFFETT: Yes.
```

THE COURT: And I'll be hearing from you and Attorney Joyce regarding that in just a moment, but apart from that, other than that objection, does Mr. Valbrun object to anything else that's contained in the revised presentence report?

MR. DUFFETT: No.

THE COURT: Mr. Valbrun, as I just indicated,

THE COURT: Mr. Valbrun, as I just indicated, there is one issue I'm going to have to resolve. It relates to the level of your role in the offense and whether you should receive -- at what level you should receive a reduction for your role in the offense and I'm going to take up with the lawyers in just a moment, but apart from that question, is there anything else in this report which you've told me you've read and understand, is there anything else in that report that you disagree with?

(Discussion off the record between the defendant and counsel)

THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And so as far as you know to your personal knowledge, the report is true; is that right?

THE DEFENDANT: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And Attorney Duffett, do you agree that apart from the issue that you've identified as being in dispute here, the report is otherwise accurate

and correct in all respects?

MR. DUFFETT: Yes, sir, other than Paragraph 19.

THE COURT: All right. And so Mr. Valbrun, you can be seated for now and Attorney Duffett, I'll hear from you first on the issue of the guidelines and Mr. Valbrun's role in the offense.

MR. DUFFETT: I just have argument on that,

Judge, thank you. Paragraph 19 in the PSR finds a two

level reduction for minor role. I submit that a four

level reduction for minimal participant is appropriate.

Judge, you're very familiar with the facts of this case and the facts of all of the other co-defendants and related cases in this matter and I just wanted to state that I believe the facts would support a larger reduction of three or even four levels.

If you look at the Application Note of 3E1.2, and Application Note 3, there is a list of factors to consider in determining where the minor or minimal role might assign and they include the degree to which the defendant understood the scope and structure of the criminal activity, the degree to which the defendant participated in planning or organizing the criminal activity, the degree to which the defendant exercised decisionmaking authority, and the nature and extent of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the defendant's participation and his responsibility and discretion that he had in conforming to that and the degree to which the defendant stood to benefit from this criminal activity and I would suggest that the facts in this case, certainly as opposed to Mr. Duffaud, who had a two level reduction, Mr. Valbrun's participation is even less than that and I think the fact that justifies a three level reduction indeed should be a four level reduction considering his relationship with Mr. Duffaud and his relationship to the entire criminal enterprise. He, Mr. Valbrun, was charged only with possession with intent. He was not charged with conspiracy. THE COURT: What, in your view, makes Mr. Valbrun's participation substantially different from Mr. Duffaud's? MR. DUFFETT: I think Mr. Duffaud recruited Mr. Valbrun. I think the sentencing memorandum of Mr. Duffaud and the trial testimony supports the concept that Mr. Duffaud rented the car and sought out Mr. Valbrun to drive the car and I think the testimony of Jacques Victor supported that and he said that this was Mr. Valbrun's only involvement. THE COURT: Thank you. That's all I have. MR. DUFFETT:

THE COURT: Thank you. Attorney Joyce.

MR. JOYCE: Your Honor, I would submit that Mr. Duffaud and Mr. Valbrun should receive the same reduction. Both of them were aware of what was happening before they left.

Mr. Valbrun was directed by Mr. Victor to hide the stuff well. That was one of the intercepts the Court heard before at trial. There were intercepts played at trial where Mr. Valbrun was interested in receiving his benefit from making the trip. My recollection is he said it was a phone that he was coming to pick up. Mr Victor testified that it was money.

Mr. Valbrun was the operator of the vehicle, knowing that there were drugs in the vehicle as the jury so found, and I would submit to the Court that there's little to distinguish the role of Mr. Valbrun and Mr. Duffaud and this basis, they should be treated the same.

THE COURT: Attorney Joyce, I want to make sure I've heard you correctly and, that is, that you've just told me that, in fact, the trial evidence was this Mr. Valbrun spoke directly to Mr. Victor. Mr. Victor had encouraged Mr. Valbrun to hide it well; is that what you told me?

MR. JOYCE: Your Honor, I'm relying on what I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
submitted as a trial brief, which was intercept number
1181 where Mr. Victor said when he called Mr. Valbrun's
phone, look for a good place to hide it -- excuse me,
look for a good place in the car to hide it well for me
and, quote, don't let the person driving act like a
monkey, do the speed limit.
         THE COURT: And that transcript reflects that
the other person on the phone was Mr. Valbrun?
         MR. JOYCE: I don't have the transcript in
front of me, Your Honor, and I don't recall what Mr.
Victor's testimony was on that point.
         THE COURT: Right. Would you please remind me
what transcript number that is?
         MR. JOYCE: Session 1181 from 1:59 p.m.
         THE COURT: Okay. Also, Attorney Joyce, I
want to ask you this. In characterizing Mr. Valbrun's
role in this offense, should we be assessing it
relative to Mr. Duffaud alone or should we be -- since
he and Mr. Duffaud are charged and they are the only
defendants charged with respect to the count for which
Mr. Valbrun was convicted, or should his role be
considered in the context of the broader indictment in
this case and the other individuals involved?
         MR. JOYCE: Your Honor, it's clear that Mr.
```

Valbrun was being held accountable only for the one day

and the drug quantities upon which he personally participated and not other aspects of the conspiracy.

I don't think the guidelines preclude the Court from considering his role as it relates simply to the count of conviction. There's no question that he's less culpable than other conspirators, but I think when the Court looks at what he is being held accountable for here and his role on the -- in the events that led to this conviction and the charge with which he faced, a two level reduction is appropriate.

In the event he were held responsible for conspiracy-wide quantities, which could be substantially more, perhaps it would be more appropriate to look at his role in the broader context. I'm not saying the Court is limited to taking that view, but I think when considering his role with what he's been convicted of and how it relates to Mr. Duffaud and the Court's determination in Mr. Duffaud's case, a two level reduction is appropriate.

THE COURT: Thank you. Attorney Duffett, anything further on this point?

MR. DUFFETT: Judge, only on that question of the transcript, I don't have that in front of me, but as I recall, he, Mr. Victor, was speaking with Mr. Duffaud and that's why he said make sure the driver

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
obeys the speed limit or something like that. Thank
1
2
    you.
3
```

THE COURT: All right. I have not brought the transcripts out on the bench with me. Excuse me just a moment. There are some wires that grabbed on to my foot.

I don't have the transcripts with me and actually to me that's a significant point and so I want to take a recess so I can retrieve the transcript and take it look at it. That shouldn't take any more than about five minutes, so we will take a brief recess at this time.

(Time noted: 12:18 p.m.)

(Recess called).

(Time noted: 12:22 p.m.)

THE COURT: The transcript that was identified in the trial record materials as session number 1181 does reflect that the conversation which occurred on March 16, 2014, in which Mr. Victor says, among other things, look for a good place in the car and hide it well for me. Look under, if you can search under, if you can go under physically yourself and so on was with Mr. Valbrun.

Based upon the revised presentence report as well as the trial evidence in this case, I find that Mr.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
Valbrun's role in the offense was substantially the
same as Mr. Duffaud. They each similarly performed
different functions, but working together they both
secreted drugs in the vehicle, in a rented vehicle,
which was then driven from Boston to Maine by Mr.
Valbrun with Mr. Duffaud in the driver's seat. They
were both involved in communications with Mr. Victor.
     I don't see a basis for distinguishing the level
of participation that they had in this offense.
Therefore I conclude that the two level adjustment that
is currently contained in the revised presentence
report is the appropriate level of adjustment for
purposes of section 3B1.2 of the sentencing guidelines.
     Anything further on that point?
         MR. JOYCE: No, Your Honor.
         MR. DUFFETT: No, sir.
         THE COURT: All right. And so with that
ruling, I take it there are -- and I've heard no other
objections to the revised presentence report, correct?
         MR. JOYCE: Correct.
         MR. DUFFETT: Correct.
         THE COURT: With that then, I will now hear
from the Government with respect to the sentence.
```

MR. JOYCE: Your Honor, it's clear from the

trial testimony what happened here and why it is we are

here. I want to take a minute now that we've compared Mr. Duffaud to Mr. Valbrun and their conduct to distinguish their conduct that happened after they were arrested and to suggest to the Court that Mr. Duffaud's sentence should include a starting point here because Mr. Valbrun's conduct is so different.

Mr. Duffaud accepted responsibility. He pled guilty. He expressed remorse. Mr. Valbrun did not. Mr. Valbrun not only exercised his right to a trial, he also testified at that trial and provided to the jury a version of events that I would suggest were wholly incredible. Should the jury have believed them, he would have been acquitted. It simply can't be said that anything but the fact that the jury flatly rejected his version of events.

What's also different as far as their conduct during the commission of the offense is that not only was Mr. Valbrun and Mr. Duffaud in the car, but there were two children, at the time age two and age nine. The three-year old Mr. Valbrun's son. The nine-year old was the child of a significant other who the PSR indicates he has significant fatherly responsibilities over. I can't comprehend why anybody would bring a two-year old and a nine-year old on a drug run.

Drug trafficking is a very dangerous business.

It's not a business for children and the only explanation I can think of as to why those two kids were in the car was to throw off the police as to what the purpose of that trip was.

It was clearly a drug delivery. It wasn't a social visit. Mr. Valbrun was most concerned on the phone about when he was going to get his money from Mr. Victor. This was a profit endeavor and I can't think of any rational explanation for why a two-year old and a nine-year old would be in the car. It just -- it's shocking and it's -- I don't quite know how to suggest to the Court it should impact on the sentence, but when the Court thinks about the nature and circumstances of the offense, that's a factor I would suggest the Court should consider.

We also have 225 grams of heroin. No question that heroin is destroying this district, it's ripping apart families, it's killing people and there's no doubt that 225 grams of heroin on the streets of southern Maine would have a devastating impact. That's not to set aside in any way the 100 grams of crack that were also in there which destroys people's lives in somewhat similar ways.

I think the Court would be well within its discretion in this case to impose a sentence that's at

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
or near the quideline range. That's a substantial
difference from what the Court imposed on Mr. Duffaud,
but there are factors in this case that I've just gone
through that I think warrant a substantially different
treatment. Maybe a guideline sentence is too severe,
but I think a departure or a variance of any
significant amount is not warranted and I'd ask the
Court to impose a sentence at or near the guideline
range.
         THE COURT: Thank you.
         (Discussion off the record between the
defendant and counsel).
         MR. DUFFETT: Thank you, Judge. First of all,
procedurally, I want to reassert and preserve all
pretrial motions, all trial motions and all post trial
motions filed by the defendant.
         THE COURT: So noted.
         MR. DUFFETT: Thank you. We did submit a
number of documents to the Court and I want to make
sure that you have those, sir. There was a letter that
I think went directly to you from his pretrial
supervision officer from Massachusetts.
         THE COURT: Yes, I have that.
         MR. DUFFETT: Thank you. There are some
```

documents from Cumberland County Jail, which we had

delivered to the Court on May 10th. 4 pages of --1 2 THE COURT: I have that. MR. DUFFETT: Thank you. And there's also on 3 May 10th we submitted a number of letters from family 4 5 and friends prior to that date. 6 THE COURT: I have the letters. 7 MR. DUFFETT: Thank you, sir. And also, we filed a motion for a variant sentence. The number on 8 9 that is docket 1163. THE COURT: I have received that, yes. 10 11 MR. DUFFETT: Thank you. The letter from the 12 supervision officer in Massachusetts that he supervised for a very lengthy period of time, Mr. Valbrun was on 13 14 pretrial release and supervision and did well. on release, he was ordered to this office in a manner 15 as directed by the Court and maintained suitable 16 17 employment. While on release, the defendant abided by 18 the directives of the probation office and was compliant in home contacts and other interactions with 19 20 the probation officer. 21 Overall, the defendant was able to adjust to his 22 pretrial supervision well and demonstrated positive

strides during this period of time. That, I understand

it, is a distinction from what Mr. Duffaud did on

pretrial supervision, I believe -- maybe it was post

23

24

25

trial, I'm not sure -- post plea, he ended up violating and committing a new offense.

The document that we submitted from the jail indicate that Mr. Valbrun availed himself of programs there and he's done well. There's a religious program certificate, computer skills class, a goal setting workshop and a construction industry standards ten-hour course which would, I think, indicate to you, Judge, and supports the idea that Mr. Valbrun is a hard worker, had a good employment history, has paid taxes for many, many years and I think this reflects his desire to get back into the workforce where he can get a good job and support his family.

(Discussion off the record between the defendant and counsel)

There are a number of letters that we submitted, Judge, and I'm just going to read from a few of them which indicate -- at least gives an idea of the kind of person Mr. Valbrun is. The last letter in the submission is from Rebecca Miller. She's the vocational instructor at the jail and she wrote -- and they don't always write these kinds of letters and we're happy that she did and she did this because she considers Jean a good person.

He is pleasant in class, does not miss his

classes, seems to enjoy learning whatever he is there to meet and that he will take new classes that are available. I will not hesitate to add him to future classes as they are offered, and again I think this letter supports the idea that Mr. Valbrun is a hard worker and provider for his family.

Now, some of the other letters in this package,
Judge, I think may give you a good idea of who Mr.

Valbrun is. The first letter from his fiancé to Jean

Valbrun indicates that they have a four-year old son

together and Jean is a wonderful father. Then she

relates an incident where giving birth to their son,

she almost lost her life due to complications and he -
Jean stood by her throughout that ordeal and has stood

by them ever since and supported her and their son.

She followed up in her last paragraph by saying my mother and the whole extended family and my children, teachers, doctors all find this to be a huge shame and sadness that someone who is hardworking and great father has to be away from us. We're all hopeful we can have him home soon.

Then the fourth letter down from Santiago, a friend of the family for the past ten years, indicates that I'm fully aware of the gravity of the crime. This is not the person I know and I'd like to give you a

perspective that shows he's more than the sum of his actions on the day of the crime.

He has a strong sense of responsibility and obligation which applies to his family, his work and the community. He grew up in an impoverished area of Boston and began working at an early age to help his mother provide and care for his younger sister. To his friends and former co-worker, Mr. Valbrun is and always has been willing to lend a hand whenever someone is in need, whether that's giving them a ride, fixing a neighbor's car or giving a homeless man at the end of the street some spare change, Mr. Valbrun was always helping out.

He goes on to say that he possesses a great deal of integrity and is someone who can always be counted on. And he follows that Mr. Valbrun, it's unfortunate he made some poor decisions that led him to where he is now, however I strongly believe that he has learned from this situation and wants to become a better person and a role model for his young son.

And four letters down from that from Merline, close friend of the family, she concludes by saying unfortunately, Mr. Valbrun has made a poor decision, but I know he has learned his lesson. To give him a chance, he will reestablish his career if he can and

continue to be a positive role model in his son's life.

Now, our motion for a variant sentence, Judge, we're asking the Court for a significant variant sentence downward and essentially the reasons that we give are outlined in the motion, but it's clear, Judge, that any sentence the Court imposes, one of the goals of Section 8553 is to promote respect for the law and to provide just punishment and the 1st Circuit has commented on that in <u>U.S. v. Martin</u>, 520 F.3d 87 (2008).

The subpart of section 3553(a) directs that a sentencing court consider the need for a sentence to, quote, promote respect for the law and to provide just punishment for the offense.

Then the <u>Gall</u> case, G-A-L-L case, the court observes -- Supreme Court case -- respect for the law diminishes the natural principles of justice, such as the principle that punishment should correlate with culpability are ignored. With this thought in mind, we have on several occasions recognized that District Court's have discretion in appropriate cases to align co-defendant sentences somewhat in order to reflect comparable degrees of culpability, at least in those cases where disparity are conspicuous and threaten to undermine confidence in the criminal justice system.

With that in mind, Judge, we want to stress the history and characteristics of Mr. Valbrun. The presentence report covers it beautifully. It's a well done presentence report and it gives you a good idea of the family background and his work history in this country.

As you can see by the number of people in the courtroom today, he comes from a large and extended and supportive family, something we don't often see in this courtroom. They have all come up here from Boston today, Judge, for this.

No prior criminal convictions, excellent employment history unlike so many that we see here. Good support from his hardworking extended family, good relationship with his fiancé, no history of alcohol or substance abuse.

Another 3553(a) factor is nature of the offense.

The Court's well-aware of the offense in this case. It was a nonviolent offense, one time conduct with a relatively minimal role.

Does Mr. Valbrun have personal and vocational plans? He certainly does. His goal is to get this past him and to get back into the community so that he can work on the goals that we state in our motion, including go to and attend and graduate from the

Benjamin Franklin Institute of Technology in

Massachusetts, get a degree in auto mechanics. He's

worked, I think, for Jiffy Lube for eight years down

there and does a good job. He wants to get a good job

in the same field when he gets out and hopefully start

his own business in that field, all with the goal of

providing a good home for his fiancé and children.

Now, I think, Judge, all of this -- we have a few speakers that briefly want to speak to you, but before they do, I think I guess what we're saying is that all of these factors I'm urging the Court to view in regards to the mandate of the 3553, to avoid sentencing disparities and as our motion indicates, if Mr. Valbrun was sentenced inside the guideline range, he would -- it would be the fourth longest sentence in this very large case. It seems to, I would argue, cast some doubt on the justice system. It would not serve to promote respect for the law and it would not be a just punishment.

Now, I realize you have to balance all of these factors in considering a variant sentence and there's no question that Mr. Valbrun went to trial. Mr. Valbrun testified, he was found guilty. It's ironic that of all the related co-defendants, I don't know how many there are, there's at least a dozen if not more,

```
he's the only one that went to trial and it would truly
be ironic and unfair if his sentence was one of the
very top sentences imposed in this case.
```

I'm urging Court to look at these factors with that as a background because he does have positive things in his life. He does have a family, he does have goals. He's not a loser, as we often see in this court. So I would urge the Court to consider a significant downward departure out of that guideline range.

We do have three speakers, Judge, if you would allow that.

THE COURT: Yes, of course.

MR. DUFFETT: Thank you. First of all, we'll have a friend. Come on up.

THE COURT: If you would please state your full name and spell your last name.

MR. AMANTAN: Santiago Amantan.

A-M-A-N-T-A-N.

THE COURT: Thank you. Please go ahead.

MR. AMANTAN: Your Honor, before you decide anything, I would like to say Jean Valbrun, I know him for so long and he's a good man, good father and a good friend. His heart -- and I know that he made some bad decisions and I know he learned his lesson and as his

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
friend, family, we want him back. We love him and we
just want him back and we want him back to be with his
son, his family, his loved ones and just love him.
Thank you.
         THE COURT: Thank you.
         MR. DUFFETT: We have Jean's sister Sonia
Valbrun.
         THE COURT: Please state your full name and
spell your last name.
         MS. VALBRUN: Marie Sonia Valbrun,
V-A-L-B-R-U-N.
         THE COURT: Thank you. Please go ahead.
         MS. VALBRUN: He is my little brother. He is
a family guy. He's a hard worker and I also have three
kids of my own. I have my 13-year old, my 9 year old,
he's here with me and I also have a four-year old.
he helped me. My kids don't even call him uncle. All
me three of my kids call him daddy. He always tried to
help me dropping them to school, pick them up for me
and I have my nine-year old, she has asthma. Sometimes
she goes to the hospital for weeks or days. He's
always there when I'm out at the hospital. He would
always come and sleep with her and help me out because
I have three.
     So it's like we ready for him. If it was a
```

```
lesson, he learned his lesson, but we all out there suffering. His kid, his own son, always comes to my house. The first thing he asks is where is my dad so I have to lie to him. I said your dad went on vacation, he is coming back home.
```

In school he always be crying. Sometimes they call me at work, I can't work the way I used to because I need to help with my kids. The teacher always be calling me because he is crying out and asking for daddy. I am the one they call, so I have to go and pick him up from school and the mother is suffering through, but we try to work it out together.

I would like to see if he could come home, do the best he can like he usually do and everybody miss him. We all want him to come back home.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. DUFFETT: And finally, Judge, his aunt.

THE COURT: If you would please state your full name and spell your last name.

MS POWELL: Janet Powell, P-O-W-E-L-L.

THE COURT: Thank you, go ahead.

MS. POWELL: I just want to say, you know, first of all my son, he's four and he's growing up without a father, it's so hard. He cries every night, mommy I want daddy, and we usually pray for him every

night before bed. He did him everything and I just think that he made a big mistake and I know that he learned from this.

He's really not a bad guy and everybody just misses him, not only for me, Your Honor, but I pray that you find it in your heart to give him something that can send him back to his son and his family.

His son is really suffering. He suffers from asthma and he has asthma attacks so often and every time he went to the hospital, he would leave work, ask for time off so he can spend the time in the hospital with his son and his son loves him so much. And our way back from Maine when this all happened, he said oh, what's your name to Santiago and I said his name is Santiago and he said Santiago, turn back and go get my daddy. He's the only one that's left there and I need my daddy. And I couldn't help him. I don't know what to tell my son.

He's like so affected by it. I don't know, it's another kid growing up with no father and it makes such a huge different to have a man whose involved with his kids and I just think he's not a bad person.

He goes to church every Sunday, he pray at night, he provides for his family, he's always worked and at times when I was like take him down, he would make sure

I'm okay. He checks up on me, he's so good to my family also and everybody just misses him.

He takes care of my daughter, who she's not his daughter biologically, but he's been there since she was two years old and she's known him all her life and she's in school right now. I just don't want them to see him in this situation and I pray that he can come back home and I know that he will be working and do the right thing and I just pray that you can, you know, find it in your heart to forgive him and send him home for us.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. DUFFETT: That's all I have, Judge. I would just add that throughout my representation of Mr. Valbrun, I've been very close with these people and they've been very involved in this case. They call me all the time. I send them updates all the time and as the presentence report indicates, they are successful people. They are good members of the community down there in Boston and it's an incredibly close family and I've never seen a family quite this large and quite this close. So that's all I have, Judge. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Duffett, I want to just have the record be clear about the exhibits that you've submitted today. First of all, with respect to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

29

would you like to speak at this time?

THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor. 1 2 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Is there 3 anything further then from the defendant? 4 MR. DUFFETT: No, sir. 5 THE COURT: Anything further from the 6 Government? 7 MR. JOYCE: No, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. I'm going to be 8 9 recessing so that I can reflect upon the arguments I've received. I expect that recess will be about 10 15 minutes after which I'll be back on the bench to 11 12 finalize this hearing. We will be in recess. (Recess called) 13 THE COURT: I received and considered in 14 15 arriving at the sentence the marked defendant's exhibits which we just discussed as well as the revised 16 17 presentence investigation report in this case as well 18 as the written motion for variant sentence that was filed by the defendant. 19 20 I want to begin with reviewing by the attorneys 21 the applicable provisions of the sentencing quidelines. The total offense level for Mr. Valbrun's offense is 22 23 26. His criminal history category is 1 and these 24 figures result in a guideline sentencing range of 63 to 25 78 months, a period of supervised release of three

years, a fine range of \$12,500 to \$1 million and renders him ineligible for probation.

Counsel, are there any objections to what I've just indicated to be the guideline provisions?

MR. JOYCE: No, Your Honor.

MR. DUFFETT: None other than preserving our objection to Paragraph 19.

THE COURT: Thank you. That is preserved. In addition to considering the documents that I've just indicated as part of my sentencing analysis in this case, Mr. Valbrun, I've also, of course, listened carefully to what the lawyers have had to say, I listened carefully to the statements made by the three individuals that spoke here in the courtroom and I also read with care all the letters that were submitted on your behalf.

In determining a sentence, it is my responsibility to consider the sentencing guidelines and the range in the case and I've done that. I'm also required by law to consider other factors. These include the nature and circumstances of the offense, your personal history and characteristics, the need for the sentence to reflect the seriousness of the offense, promote respect for the law, provide just punishment, the need for a sentence to afford deterrence, protect the public from

further crimes by you and to provide you with needed educational or vocational training, care or other correctional treatment. Also of particular significance, I think, to this sentence is the need to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities and I'll be discussing that a bit more.

I've considered all those factors and others in arriving at your sentence, but my focus has been on your personal history and characteristics as well as the nature and circumstances of the offense. You had a trial. The jury found you guilty of possession with the intent to distribute heroin and cocaine base, aiding and abetting.

Turning first to Mr. Valbrun's personal characteristics, today he's 28 years old. Born in Haiti and came to America as a child. He has an extended family here that is close and as a matter of fact has appeared with him at court proceedings. He's not a United States citizen.

It's indicated that you grew up in an impoverished section of Boston and has had to make his way by his own efforts. As an adult, he's done that. He's been continuously employed. The record is clear that he's taken responsibility for being a father of his son who is now four, as well as providing for his fiancé and

her now nine-year old daughter.

He has many people in his life who trust him and obviously care about him as demonstrated today by the people who are present. He's described in these letters as having some very good qualities, being loving, helpful, respectful, generous and someone who can always be counted on. I have no doubt of the sincerity of the way that he's been characterized by those people that know him and therefore took those representations that he has those qualities.

Mr. Valbrun was arrested on May 22nd of 2014 and he remained out on bail from that time until his conviction, which was November 24th of 2015. He complied with all requirements of bail as set.

He's been incarcerated now since the trial for more than six months. He's had no disciplinary incidents at the Cumberland County Jail. He's participated in -- including several skills related programs as well as religious programming.

His criminal history category for purposes of the guideline is one and he has a record having been charged with crimes twice for events unrelated to the current charge, but he has no convictions or other offenses, and neither of the alleged crimes for which he was charged and not convicted involved drugs.

He denies any substance abuse history and I can find no other evidence in the record that I have seen to suggest that he's abused drugs or alcohol or is need in treatment for the same.

Turning to the circumstances of this offense, Mr. Valbrun was recruited to act as a drug courier along with his half-brother, Mr. Duffaud. In exchange for money, they agreed to hide drugs in a car, rented car, and transport it to Lewiston from Boston.

The drugs, besides quantities which are identified in the revised presentence report, consisted of heroin and cocaine base. These were significant quantities and let the record be clear that I adopt the revised presentence report as my findings in all respects.

Mr. Valbrun drove the car. Mr. Duffaud was in the passenger seat in the front. In the back were Mr. Valbrun's son, then age two, and his fiancé's daughter, age nine. There's been no plausible explanation given for the presence of the children during the commission of this crime other than that suggested by Mr. Joyce; that the presence of the children would lend an air of legality to what was going on. They were decoys, in effect, and of course the presence of the children makes this particularly appalling.

At trial, Mr. Valbrun testified that he was not

aware that there were drugs in the car and that his purpose in coming to Maine was to purchase a cellphone; in other words, he positioned himself as perhaps an unwitting victim of his co-defendant, Mr. Duffaud. His version of his involvement is, of course, in direct conflict with a substantial amount of evidence that was received which established that, in fact, he knew exactly what he was doing and what was going on, even evidence of a phone conversation which reflected that he knew exactly what was going on and it's directly in conflict with the jury's verdict.

As a result, Mr. Valbrun has received an enhancement under the guidelines for obstruction of justice and, Mr. Valbrun, I will say to you directly now that you have an absolute right to testify in this case and I certainly would not in any way factor into or hold against you in arriving at a sentence in this case the fact that you chose to have a trial, the right to testify, those are your rights, but you do not have the right to take the stand and testify falsely about a matter that was material to this case.

To fall within the purview of this guideline provision for obstruction of justice requires a finding that there was false testimony under oath concerning a matter material to the proceeding and that testimony

was given with the willful intent to provide false testimony rather than as a result of confusion, mistake or faulty memory.

Not only did the jury reject Mr. Valbrun's version of what was going on and what was in his mind, but I, of course, was present for his testimony myself and I am satisfied that, in fact, testimony was false and qualifies as perjury for purposes of the application of the guideline provision that we're discussing, that is, obstructing justice.

Mr. Valbrun's commission of this crime, which is serious, and his false testimony, which the jury rejected and I have found to be false, establish a need for a sentence of imprisonment in this case that will reflect that, reflect the seriousness of all this and not unduly minimize the seriousness of it.

The seriousness of this particular crime has to be understood in the context of the opiate crisis that is devastating the lives of innumerable people in Maine and elsewhere. It is taking a particular toll on the Lewiston/Auburn community and, of course, this is the community where Mr. Valbrun and Duffaud were going to be delivering the drugs they were transporting.

Now, mention has been made of the sentence that I imposed on Mr. Duffaud, Mr. Valbrun's co-defendant in

this case, and one of the objectives of sentencing is to avoid unwarranted disparities in sentences and the keyword there is unwarranted because there are cases in which sentencing disparities are warranted and I conclude that this is one, and I believe that the disparity as between the sentence Mr. Duffaud received and that Mr. Valbrun should receive is required and justified on the basis that Mr. Valbrun -- it was Mr. Valbrun who was responsible for involving his son and his fiancé's daughter in the commission of this crime and, in addition, it is Mr. Valbrun who testified falsely.

However, the period of incarceration in this case has to also stand for Mr. Valbrun's personal history and characteristics that I've already described and that are more fully described in the revised presentence investigation report. Here I have an adult before me whose life is otherwise marked by being dutiful about his work, taking his personal responsibility seriously, earning the trust of his family and the people that are close to him and who has no criminal record. I have also considered, as I've been urged to, his family circumstances and the impact of his incarceration on his son.

I would note that the lower end of the guideline

range in this case is 63 months. That means the sentence would be more than five years. Weighing all of this, I have concluded that on balance, a substantial prison sentence must be imposed because of the seriousness of the offense and the other circumstances that I've just described that contribute to my view that this was a serious offense, but I also conclude that the section 3553(a) factors related to Mr. Valbrun's personal history and characteristics do support a variant below the guideline sentence.

And so before I impose sentence, counsel, have I addressed any of the issues that you've raised with respect to sentence in this case?

MR. JOYCE: Yes, you have.

MR. DUFFETT: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Valbrun, if you will stand please. Based upon all these considerations, Mr. Valbrun, it's my responsibility to arrive at a sentence of imprisonment that is sufficient, but not greater than that necessary to achieve its purposes and the primary purposes of the sentence is -- the sentence in this case it seems to me has to reflect the seriousness of what's occurred and provide for just punishment and also provide adequate deterrence by not unduly minimizing the crime.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

39

For those reasons, I conclude that what is just and fair under all these circumstances is that you be committed to the custody of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a total term of 28 months.

Attorney Duffett, are you making any respect with respect to Mr. Valbrun's placement?

MR. DUFFETT: Near Massachusetts, if possible.

THE COURT: All right. And so I will so indicate in the judgment in this case. And so Mr. Valbrun, at the conclusion of this hearing, you'll be remanded to the custody of the United States Marshal to begin your sentence.

Upon release from imprisonment, I'm ordering that you be on supervised release for a term of three years. You're responsible to report to the probation office in the district to which you are released within 72 hours. You're not to commit another federal, state or local You're not to illegally possess a controlled substance. You are to cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed and you're not to possess a firearm, ammunition, destructive device or any other dangerous weapon; do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I'm imposing the Court's standard conditions of release adopted in this district.

```
Attorney Duffett, have you reviewed with Mr. Valbrun
1
     the standard conditions?
2
              MR. DUFFETT: Yes.
3
 4
              THE COURT: And are you satisfied that he
     understands them?
5
6
              MR. DUFFETT: Yes.
7
              THE COURT: Mr. Valbrun, is that correct, you
     understand the standard conditions?
8
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
9
              THE COURT: I'm also imposing the following
10
11
     special condition of release. A U.S. probation officer
12
     may conduct a search of you and of anything you own,
     use or possess if the officer reasonably suspects that
13
14
     you are violating a condition of supervised release,
15
     and reasonably suspects that evidence of the violation
     will be found in the areas to be searched. Searches
16
     must be conducted at a reasonable time and in a
17
18
     reasonable manner. Failure to submit to a search may
     be grounds for revocation of release.
19
20
           Is there any objection to that special condition?
21
              MR. DUFFETT:
                            No.
22
              THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.
23
              THE COURT: All right. And you understand it,
     Mr. Valbrun?
24
25
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
THE COURT: I'm imposing a special assessment
of $100. I find Mr. Valbrun that you do not have the
ability to pay a fine and therefore I'm not going to
impose a fine in this case and as I recall, Attorney
Joyce, there's no request for forfeiture in this case;
is there?
         MR. JOYCE: That's correct, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: Thank you. Before I advise Mr.
Valbrun of his right to appeal, counsel, is there
anything else that I've not addressed that you believe
needs to be addressed?
         MR. JOYCE: No, Your Honor.
         MR. DUFFETT: No, sir.
         THE COURT: Mr. Valbrun, to exercise your
right to appeal your conviction and the sentence that
I've just imposed, you must file with the clerk of
court within 14 days of today a written notice of
appeal; do you understand?
         THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: If you fail to do that, you'll
have given up your right to appeal both the sentence
and the conviction; do you understand?
         THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: Also, if you can't afford to file
the appeal, you can appeal without cost. Simply
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

request the clerk to prepare and file the notice of appeal on your behalf. Again, do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Valbrun, by all indications of the record that I have in front of me, it's my expectation that once you've completed your prison sentence that you're not going to commit more crimes.

> No, Your Honor. THE DEFENDANT:

THE COURT: That has not been your path in life until now and this offense and the way you conducted yourself at trial are beyond my ability to explain, but I truly hope that they were an aberration for you and that the trust that so many people seem to have in you is really in the end who you really are and what you're made of, that you made some terrible judgments here and that have landed you in terrible trouble, but that you have it in you to get beyond this.

Serve your prison time, be successful on supervision and when you're done with this, move on with your life and do the right thing. So that's my expectation for you and that's what I hope you will do. I hope that you will use your time incarcerated to improve yourself and take advantage of everything that's offered to you and that's a big down time. It's

```
1
     a chance to come out a better person and that's my hope
2
     for you.
3
           With that, counsel, anything further?
              MR. JOYCE: No, Your Honor, thank you.
4
5
              THE COURT: All right. Court will be in
6
     recess.
7
              (End of proceeding).
8
                CERTIFICATION
9
     I, Dennis Ford, Official Court Reporter for the United
10
     States District Court, District of Maine, certify that
11
     the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record
12
     of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
13
     Dated: September 29, 2016
14
                /s/ Dennis Ford
15
                Official Court Reporter
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```